

Docket No: SACHP0145US**Serial No. 10/642,438****REMARKS**

Claims 1-59 are pending in the application. Claims 1-59 have been subjected to both a restriction requirement and an election of species requirement in the Office action to which this paper is responsive.

Response to Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action dated 13 September 2005, the claims were subjected to a restriction requirement (Applicants note that the Office Action summary page incorrectly indicates that the claims have been rejected rather than having been subjected to a restriction/election requirement), between the following allegedly distinct inventions:

Group I, claims 1-13, 16, 17, 20-52 and 56-59, drawn to an ionic liquid composition containing a cation having more than 4 carbon atoms and an anion selected from one of two sulfonated carboxylates;

Group II, claims "1-15" and 18-19 (which Applicants understand to correctly refer to claims **14-15** and 18-19), drawn to an ionic liquid as in Group I but also containing a catalyst;

Group III, claim 53, drawn to a hydrocarbon fuel composition containing an ionic liquid; and

Group IV, claims 54-55, drawn to a polymer composition containing an ionic liquid.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants hereby elect Group I (claims 1-13, 16, 17, 20-52 and 56-59) for examination. The election is made with traverse.

Applicants respectfully but strongly traverse the required separation of the dependent claims 14, 15, 18 and 19 in Group II from Group I. These claims quite clearly depend from claim 1 (respectively through claims 2, 7, 8 or 9). The mere addition of a catalyst to the ionic liquid composition of claim 1 should not reasonably

Docket No: SACHP0145US**Serial No. 10/642,438**

cause these claims to be considered a different invention. These claims simply do not represent a sufficiently different invention to justify their restriction out of the present application. The reference cited by the Examiner in support of the contention that the invention of Group II can be practiced with another materially different product, U.S. Patent No. 4,827,072, fails to support the Examiner's contention. Claims 14, 15, 18 and 19 do not claim the catalyst standing alone; rather these claims are drawn to the same subject matter as claim 1, but further comprising a catalyst. This alleged basis for restriction fails to comply with MPEP 806.04 or 808.01.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction of claims 14, 15, 18 and 19 as separate from the invention of Group I be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If the Examiner considers that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

It is believed no fee is required for this filing. However, if a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 18-0988, Order No. SACHP0144US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

DATE: December 21, 2005


Thomas W. Adams, Reg. No. 35,047

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
Ph: (216) 621-1113
Fax: (216) 621-6165

B:\Adams-Tom\Client Files\SACH\145\SACHP0145US.RReply.wpd